

Analysis of Concepts Affecting the Public Policies

Amritanshu Pandey^{1*} & S.P. Shukla²

¹PhD Research Scholar, ²Professor & Head, ^{1,2}Department of Political Science, Govt. T.R.S. College, Rewa, MP, India.

*Corresponding Author E-mail: drgovindpandey@rediffmail.com, dramritanshu25@gmail.com



DOI: Under Assignment

Copyright: © 2022 Amritanshu Pandey & S.P. Shukla. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Article Received: 17 February 2022

Article Accepted: 22 April 2022

Article Published: 26 May 2022

ABSTRACT

“Public Policy Analysis” involves in the evaluation of issues of public importance with objective of providing facts and statistics about extent and impact of different policies of Government. Nowadays, public policy analysis is undertaken by scholars from different applied physical and biological sciences (e.g. technology assessments, environmental impact studies, seismic risk analyses, etc.). Presently, the focus is on public policy analysis as it is conducted within the social and behavioural sciences, mainly Political Science, Sociology and Economics. Generally, the public policy addresses real or sensed problems, so the public policy analysis is mostly devoted to defining or clarifying the problems and assessing the needs. Main objective of public policy analysis is to assess the degree to which policies are meeting their aims. Policy analysis plays an important role to define and outline the aims of a proposed policy, and also has role to identify the similarities and differences in expected outcomes and estimated costs with competing alternative policies. Several public policies are formulated to solve both the current and future problems, and so the policy analysis attempts to forecast future requirements based on present concomitant with the past conditions. A large number of works in the field of public policy analysis involves for the development of the conceptual schemes or typologies which help to sort out different types of policies, or analyses of policies. Many literatures on public policy analysis, and especially on impact evaluation are chiefly methodological in character; indeed, many recent innovations in research procedure have been developed by research scholars working on applied problems. Many texts in ‘evaluation research’ recommend an assessment of the ‘evaluability’ of the programme prior to initiate the evaluation itself. ‘Implementation analysis’ is an essential component of all capable policy evaluations. ‘Utilisation’ is an ongoing problem in the field of evaluation research. Evaluation results affect the public policy by serving as the impetus for public discourse and debate which form social policy, rather than through extensive programme termination or reform.

Keywords: Evaluation research, Implementation analysis, Outcome analysis, Public policy analysis, Utilisation.

1. Introduction

‘Public Policy’ denotes the rules, regulations and guidelines formulated by the Government for solving problems which have an impact on the common public and society. There must be sufficient description of public policy for proper evaluation and understanding, but several public policies are very complex, especially as delivered in the field. There is a very long list of various public policies such as health policy, housing policy, tax policy, environmental policy, etc. For example, a single element of poverty policy- ‘Temporary Assistance to Needy Families’ (TANF) has different eligibility requirements, administrative procedures and payment levels in each State of the USA. Hence, the correct policy description is by no means a straightforward task (Haveman, 1977; Levitan, 1985; Simon, 2017; Wikipedia, 2022a).

‘Public Policy Analysis’ involves in the evaluation of issues of public importance with the objective of providing the facts and statistics about extent and impact of different policies of Government. Public policy analysis is concerned with the application of social science theories and methods to analyze matters of public importance. Public policy analysis is a large, sprawling intellectual enterprise that involves several academic disciplines, private research organizations and governmental agencies, each sharing a common matter with the formulation, implementation or consequences of the public policy decisions (Simon, 2017; StateUniversity.com, 2022; Wikipedia, 2022b).

Nowadays, the public policy analysis is undertaken by scholars from different applied physical and biological sciences (e.g. technology assessments, environmental impact studies, seismic risk analyses, etc.). At present,

however, the focus is on public policy analysis as it is conducted within the social and behavioural sciences, mainly Political Science, Sociology and Economics. Various research works conducted under the rubric of public policy analysis, even when restricted to the social science component, have been found perhaps as the distinguishing characteristic of the subject. Rogers (1989) has developed a typology of the public policy research which is useful for this purpose.

Generally, the public policy addresses real or sensed problems, so the public policy analysis is mostly devoted to defining or clarifying the problems and assessing the needs. For example, what are the health care needs of a particular neighborhood? what are the housing or nutritional needs of the nation's poverty population? what social services do homeless persons require? Thus, the development and formulation of public policy will be increased when underlying needs have been sufficiently described and analyzed. Several literatures on the theory and practice of problem definition and needs assessment, and students seeking additional information have been narrated (Johnson et al., 1987).

2. Objective and Role of Public Policy Analysis

Main objective of public policy analysis is to assess the degree to which the policies are meeting their aims. Policy analysis plays an important role to define and outline the aims of a proposed policy, and also has role to identify similarities and differences in expected outcomes and estimated costs with competing the alternative policies (Simon, 2017).

Policy analysis, evaluation, formulation, adoption and implementation of a principle or course of action have been intended to ameliorate the economic, social or other public issues. The policy analysis is concerned mainly with the policy alternatives which are expected to give novel solutions. Complexities of policy analysis have contributed to development and growth of policy science, which applies various theories and tools from the hard sciences (e.g. Biology and Chemistry), social sciences (e.g. Sociology, Psychology and Anthropology), and humanities (e.g. History and Philosophy) in an effort to better understand the aspects of human society, its problems and solutions for those problems. Policy analysis is important in modern complex societies, which specifically have large number of public policies, and sophisticated and mostly interconnected challenges, as public policies have many political, social and economic matters. Thus, policy analysis helps public officials to understand how political, social and economic conditions change and how public policies must evolve in order to meet changing need of a changing society (Simon, 2017; StateUniversity.com, 2022; Wikipedia, 2022c).

3. Formulation of Public Policy Analysis

Several public policies are formulated to solve both the current and future problems, and so the policy analysis attempts to forecast the future requirements based on present concomitant with the past conditions. Thus, policy outcomes may be seen in many forms, such as tangible outputs and less-tangible outputs for which the impacts are more difficult to evaluate. It is fruitful to determine if the policy is responsible for the desired change; otherwise, there may be no necessity for the public policy. The policy analysts generally use theoretically grounded statistical models to evaluate if policy will have the desired impact. In final stage of policy analysis, the policy analysts correlate the data to determine which policy alternative will be best to fulfil present and future requirements. Social

Science has an important role in the formulation of public policy, as well as its description or evaluation. Many of the issues which policy attempts to address have been the focus on the basic social science research, including ill health, poverty, crime, violence, homelessness and many others. In fact, it has been hypothesized that major reason for failure of social programmes is that they are typically designed by amateurs who are largely innocent of social science theory, concepts and results, and different job programmes, mental health interventions and crime reduction policies are also reasons of such failure (Simon, 2017).

As per the need, any number of policies might be developed to address. If an area is found to have unmet health needs, it is better to open the freestanding clinics, or to provide subsidized health insurance. It should also be seen that whether our policies are fit as regard to the homeless attempt to ameliorate the conditions of a homeless existence, or prevent the people from becoming homeless in the first place. Estimating the relative desirability of policy options is only rarely an empirical matter, and such decisions are mostly ethical or ideological. The unavoidable role of the values in the process of policy analysis and ensuing conflicts for policy analyst has been emphasized by MacRae (1985). The author identified the four main '*end values*' widely shared throughout the American society and against which the policy decisions can be compared. These include economic benefit, subjective well-being, equity and social integration. Simon (2017) mentioned that unfortunately the policies which maximize the equity may not maximize the net economic benefit; those which increase the social integration may destroy subjective well-being.

Number of works in the field of public policy analysis involves for development of conceptual schemes or typologies which help to sort out different types of policies, or analyses of policies. Many conceptual schemes have been reviewed for typifying policies and policy analyses, with useful suggestions for synthesis; the former is an especially good overview of the field as a whole (Dubnick and Bardes, 1983; Nagel, 1984).

4. Methods of Public Policy Analysis

The issues of internal and external validity, errors of measurement and specification and proper statistical modeling, etc. are more than the methodological niceties to the policy analyst; they are worrisome, ever-present and potentially consequential threats to the accuracy of one's conclusions, and to the policy decisions which ensue. A technical error in a journal article can be corrected in a simple retraction; an equivalent error in a policy analysis might result in wrong-headed or counter-productive policies being pursued. Hence, several literatures on public policy analysis, and especially on impact evaluation are chiefly methodological in character; indeed, many recent innovations in research procedure have been developed by research scholars working on applied problems. Many texts with comprehensive overview and highly advanced researches are available on the methodology of public policy analysis (Judd and Kenny, 1981; Rossi et al., 1998).

In this way, two types of '*empirical public policy analysis*' are discussed herein (Simon 2017; StateUniversity.com, 2022): (A) Qualitative Study, (B) Quantitative Study.

Qualitative Study: In this study, a variety of different tools are used, e.g. some qualitative studies include archival analysis, studying policy history and determining what has been done in the past to solve certain policy problems. This study might also involve personal interviews, asking individuals to describe in words a variety of issues

surrounding the policy process from policy agendas to formulation, implementation and evaluation. The interviews with policy makers and with the clientele being served by a particular policy may provide valuable information about the policy objectives, processes and outcomes. '*Archival analysis*' is especially important in public policy analysis. Through studies of '*policy history*', the policy analysts may learn important lessons from earlier times and apply those lessons to current or future problems and aims. A new policy aim can be highly innovative and cost-effective, and ensure to achieve worthy aims, but the archival research can show the hidden costs and pitfalls which might cause the failure of policy. '*Personal interview*' is also an important method for the improvement of public policy. The public policy is formulated and implemented by professionals working in Government, generally for the entire career. Through their individual experiences in particular policy areas, the experiences of elected and appointed officials become key policy makers. When these professionals leave the Government service, their experience and vast knowledge are mostly lost. One way to prevent this is to document the informal lessons or experiences of senior elected and appointed officials. The personal interviews are probably the most effective method of accomplishing this aim, mostly because a personal interview technique will allow for a high degree of flexibility in gathering information.

Quantitative Study: This has a great importance for the policy analysts in their efforts on the important policy issues. '*Cost-benefit analysis*' is one of the most common forms of quantitative policy analysis. It is mainly concerned with comparing the amount of expected or known benefits produced from a particular policy choice with the expected or known costs associated with that choice. Of the two elements of equation, the evaluation of costs is more easily computed. The costs are mostly measured in monetary terms and the labour and supplies are easily converted to dollar costs. While there are always hidden costs associated with any policy decision, such costs may be estimated given previous experiences in prior public policy endeavours. The opportunity costs, i.e. the costs concerned with choosing a particular policy over an alternative policy may also be determined. Calculation of benefit is mostly difficult endeavour. For this, the benefits must be assigned a numeric value and most frequently the numeric value is made in monetary terms. However, the most aspects of public policy benefit are not easily calculated in monetary terms. The individual clientele of a policy and individual officials fulfilling policy objectives have much more influence on the quality of a policy outcome or output, but the calculation of a benefit is often evaluated and aggregated in a manner which fails to capture those nuances. Despite limitations in estimation, the benefits must be measured in monetary or unit output terms for a cost-benefit calculation. The policy makers may determine the benefit estimates through survey research by asking clientele of a policy to show how the public policy has impacted their lives. The policy makers also see the benefit in terms of the output of a policy, i.e. the number of individuals who were served. For example, in higher education policy, the policy makers may do surveys of alumni to estimate the impact of their higher education experience on their salary level, and also inquire about their positive and negative experiences at the university or college. In addition, the policy makers may conduct a head count of the number of student credit hours generated, and the number of university or college graduates to measure policy output so as to see the benefit from it.

Scientists have undertaken many policy analyses focused on processes by which policy is made at federal, state and local levels. Best examples are passage analysis of Medicare by Marmor (1970) and study of ill-fated '*Family*

'Assistance Plan' proposed early in Nixon administration by Moynihan (1973), but never enacted. Public policy is made as replete with '*dirty linen*' of political process: competing and warring constituencies, equally legitimate but contradictory objectives and values, vote trading, compromises and deals, political posturing by key actors, intrusions by lobbying, advocacy and special interest groups, manipulation of public sentiment and understanding- in short, '*booming, buzzing confusion*' of a fractious and pluralistic political system.

5. Public Policy Analysis as a Major in College

The students who opt for the public policy analysis as a major in the college are taught about different methods for analysing the proposed solutions to common social problems. As a part of their education, they are taught to differentiate between the correct and faulty research which forms the basis of major policy decisions. They adopt various analytical techniques such as the cost-benefit analysis to assess the implication of applying the proposed solution. They get the opportunity to interact with various community leaders to discuss the economic development policies and programmes. The students of the public policy analysis are required to intern for a semester, and this offers a valuable chance for them to get first-hand experience of getting involved in the policy making. The students of public policy analysis are mostly needed to present a paper on any policy having a bearing on the society. While pursuing a major part in the public policy analysis, the students use various economic theories and tools such as the cost-benefit analysis to evaluate the policy decisions. It is better as well as important that they receive the chance to formulate and critique the important policies which make an impact on the society and environment (Simon 2017).

6. Complexities

The public policy is dynamic which requires those policy makers who can adjust the policy to changing conditions and requirements. When a change of policy direction or emphasis occurs, it usually needs increased resource expenditures, e.g. if a public school's administrators determine that the students' reading disabilities are impeding their general progress in the school, it might be necessary to increase the resources devoted to reading programmes. The objective would be to enhance the benefit as a result of increased expenditure on a particular facet of a public policy. The increased benefit is called a '*marginal benefit*', while the increased cost is referred to as a '*marginal cost*'. In the cost-benefit analysis, the important marginal increases in cost are justifiable as '*increased benefits*'. If a benefit does not increase at a rate greater than the cost increases, then the marginal policy changes are economically inefficient. The dynamic quality of the public policy is also considered in a procedure called as '*discounting*'. The value of a particular resource (e.g. money) does not remain the same over time. For instant, the money which is not spent can grow in value, simply by gaining interest or investment value potential is lost. The longer the money remains invested, the greater the potential value which may be generated. Therefore, the current resources frequently have the greater potential value than the resources collected or retained in the future years; not all money is equal once time is factored into the analysis. The discounting procedure allows the policy makers to compare the monetary values on an equal basis, thus making the cost-benefit analyses more accurate as both the present and future costs are associated with a policy (Simon 2017).

Ability to conduct accurate and complete cost-benefit analyses is usually hampered by a variety of other factors which play role in public policy. When one chooses to move or not to move in a particular policy direction, there is

risk of policy failures. Such risks might mean that resources which were spent with good intentions never produced an expected benefit. Most of the time, risks of failure are so high that policy makers avoid potential political ire by simply not choosing to take on high-risk (yet potentially valuable) policy goals. The existing public policy generally carries with it a lower level of risk than the newer public policies. More often, there are unforeseen indirect start-up costs related with new policies. In addition, public policies are generally not clear, and need establishment of rules and procedures for day-to-day use. Costs of implementation cannot always be measured before a public policy is put into place. However, they must be factored into cursory cost-benefit analysis to estimate feasibility of a particular prospective public policy. Whether the Government is considering new issues for public policy, or simply implementing existing policy, the changing nature of society's necessity must be determined. In this, people migrate, economic and social conditions change, and nature of public problems involve. Demographic analysis played an important part in documenting the rise of economic and social inequality which arose in the post-World War II period (Simon 2017; StateUniversity.com, 2022).

Decision theory is an attempt to explore all possible contingencies extant in a particular policy. The approach is especially useful after a particular policy has been adopted by the Government. Following policy adoption, the details of policy practice must be explored in full. The Government agencies in charge of meeting those goals frequently must determine how to deal with a variety of alternative decisions which will have to be made and what outcomes (and the value of those outcomes) are likely from each of those decisions.

Thus, the decision theory involves determining the probability which various events will occur and factoring that probability into the decision analysis. The policy analysts may use experimentation to cost-effectively '*test*' public policy alternatives. Experiments are one the most effective methods of measuring a causal connection between the presence of a public policy and particular outcomes. However, the policy experiments can face the ethical challenges, e.g. denying a policy benefit to those outside of the experiment can be harmful. In contrast, the ethical challenges arise when the individuals face a poor or bad policy (Simon 2017; StateUniversity.com, 2022).

7. Evaluation Research

Many barriers are there to be overcome in deciding whether a policy or programme has produced its intended (or any) effects. Firstly, the notion of '*intended effects*' pre-supposes clearly defines and articulates the programme goals, but many policies are enacted without a clear statement of the goals. So, many texts in '*evaluation research*' recommend an assessment of the '*evaluability*' of the programme prior to initiate the evaluation itself. The second barrier is the often-pronounced difference between '*programme-as-designed*' and the '*programme-as-delivered*', as mentioned in the '*implementation analysis*'. The most troublesome methodological issue in '*evaluation research*' lies in establishing the "*ceteris paribus*" (or "*all else equal*") condition, or in other words, in estimating what might have happened in the absence of the programme to be evaluated. In an era of declining birth rates, any fertility reduction programme will appear to be successful; in an era of declining crime rates, any crime reduction programme will appear to be successful. So, how can one differentiate between programme effects and things which would have happened anyway owing to exogenous conditions? Due to this *ceteris paribus* problem, many evaluations are designed as experiments or quasi-experiments. In the '*experiments*', subjects are randomly assigned to various treatments and control conditions, and the outcomes are monitored.

Randomization in essence ‘initializes’ all the starting conditions to the same values (except for the vagaries of chance). In the recent history of evaluation research, different negative income tax (NIT) experiments (Rossi and Lyall, 1976) are the best-known examples of large-scale field experiments of this general sort. *Quasi-experiments* are any number of research designs which do not involve randomization, but use other methods to establish the *ceteris paribus* condition (Cook and Campbell, 1979).

As the research setting comes to more closely mimic real-world conditions (i.e. as it develops high external validity), the ability to detect real effects mostly declines. The final problem in doing evaluation research is that most policies or programmes are relatively small interventions intended to address rather large, complex social issues. For example, the poverty rate is a complex function of the rate of employment, trends in world economy, prevailing wage rates, provisions of social welfare system and a host of additional macrostructural factors. In opposite, any given antipoverty programme will be a relatively small-scale intervention focused on one or a few components of the larger problem, generally restricted to one or a few segments of the population. Mostly, the overall effects of different large-scale, macrostructural factors will completely swamp the program effects- not because the programme effects were not present or meritorious, but because they are very small relative to exogenous effects. The literatures on the theory and practice of evaluation research are expansive; however, these can be well noted as cited by Chambers et al. (1992) and Rossi et al. (1998). Furthermore, other examples of ways in which the evaluation can impact practice have been discussed in “*New Directions for Evaluation*” by Gueron (1997), Lipsey (1997) and Wholey (1997).

8. Outcomes and Public Opinion

There are great variations in the outcomes of the public policy analysis. On one side, the policy analysis gives elected and non-elected Government decision makers to provide a greater understanding of a policy problem and the possible solutions. Through the policy analysis, it is possible to receive a greater understanding of the projected costs and the possible benefits which will emerge from the adoption of a particular policy alternative.

The decision makers usually seek the most economical alternative possible- the alternative which offers the most in the way of benefit and the least in the way of cost. Therefore, the policy analysis can help the decision makers to make the rational decisions easily (Simon 2017).

Outcome analysis, therefore, examines the cost effectiveness, or cost benefit of a given policy, programme or intervention. The cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analyses are intrinsically complex and technically demanding subjects. One complication lies in assessing the ‘*opportunity costs*’. A dollar (or rupee) spent in one way is a dollar (or rupee) no longer available to use in some other way. Thus, investing the dollar in any particular intervention means that one has lost the ‘*opportunity*’ to invest that dollar in something which may have been far more beneficial. Secondly, the complication is also in the ‘*accounting perspective*’ in which one chooses to evaluate the costs and benefits. For example, in a ‘*Food Stamp Programme*’, the recipient gains a benefit (a coupon which can be redeemed for food) at no cost; from the accounting perspective of that recipient, the benefit-cost ratio is thus infinite. This ‘*Food Stamp Programme*’ is administered by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and from the USDA perspective, the benefit of the programme presumably lies in the contribution it makes to relieving hunger and malnutrition in the population; the cost lies in whatever it takes to administer the programme,

redeem the coupons once submitted by food outlets, etc. Accounted against USDA perspective, the benefit-cost ratio will be very different, and it will be different again when accounted against perspective of society as a whole. Of course, the latter accounting requires asking what it is worth to us as a nation to provide food to those who might otherwise have to go without, clearly a moral question more than an empirical or analytic one (Simon 2017; StateUniversity.com, 2022).

If the outcome cannot be converted to a dollar value, then a strict comparison to the dollar costs cannot be made and a true benefit-cost ratio cannot be calculated. In contrast, the cost effectiveness analysis compares the benefits of one programme (expressed in any unit) at one cost to the benefits of another programme (expressed in the same unit) at a different cost. Hence, a programme that spends \$10,000 to save one life is more cost effective than another programme that spends \$20,000 to save one life. Whether either programme is cost beneficial, however, cannot be determined unless one is willing to assign a dollar value to a human life. Many texts by economists deal at length with these and related complexities (Levin, 1975; Yates, 1996).

The public opinion in a democratic society, however, is supposed to '*count*' in the policy formation process. Sometimes it does, and mostly often it does not. Hence, the policy analysis sometimes involves plumbing the depths and sources of support or opposition to different policy initiatives; and in a larger sense, explicating the process by which the policy becomes legitimated. The answer is not clear to the question whether, or under what conditions the public opinion dictates the direction of public policy. The policy makers are sensitive to public opinion and many presidents are morbidly fascinated by their standing in the polls (Sussman, 1988). However, it is also that several policies with strong majority supports are never enacted into the law. A study of the effects of public opinion on policy formation has been done by Verba and Nie (1975).

9. Implementation Analysis

'*Implementation analysis*' is an essential component of all capable policy evaluations. There are several reasons why '*programme-as-delivered*' differ from '*programme-as-designed*': technical impossibility, bureaucratic inertia, exogenous influences and unanticipated conditions. An elegantly designed policy experiment can fail at the point of randomization, if programme personnel let their own sentiments about '*worthy*' and '*unworthy*' clients override randomizing process.

Several educational policy initiatives are subverted because teachers persist in their same old ways despite the programme admonition to do things differently. Moreover, the real world finds ways to impinge in unexpected and often unwanted ways on any policy initiative; failure to anticipate these impingements has caused failure of many policy experiments (Simon 2017).

Loftin and McDowell (1981) provided the utility of implementation analysis in their evaluation of the effects of '*Detroit mandatory sentencing law*'. The policy-as-designed required a mandatory two-year '*add on*' to the prison sentence of any person convicted of a felony involving a firearm. On the contrary, the rate of firearms crime did not decline after the law was enacted. The implementation analysis provided the reason. Judges, well aware of the overcrowded conditions in the state's prisons, were loath to increase average prison sentences. Yet, the state law required that two years be added to the charge. To resolve the dilemma, the Judges in firearms cases would begin by

reducing the main sentence by two or more years, and then adding the mandated two-year 'add-on', so that the overall sentence remained about the same even as the Judges remained in technical compliance with policy (Chambers et al., 1992).

10. Utilisation

'Utilisation' is an ongoing problem in the field of evaluation research. A more detailed treatment of utilisation problem can be taken, as stated by Chambers et al. (1992), Shadish et al. (1991) and Weiss (1988). Many reasons for non-utilisation have been identified. One of the most important is timeliness. Good research takes time, whereas policy decisions are mostly made quickly, well before the results of analysis are in. Negative income tax (NIT) experiments were stimulated in substantial part by a '*Nixon administration*' proposal for a modified negative income tax to replace the then-current welfare system. The shortest of experiments ran for three years; many ran for five years; none were completed by the time, Nixon proposal was killed mainly on political basis. A second factor in the non-utilisation of policy studies is that research is seldom unequivocal. Even the best-designed and best-executed policy researches will be accompanied by many caveats, conditions and qualifications which strictly limit the safe policy inferences one may draw from them. Of course, the policy makers prefer simple declarative conclusions; the policy research rarely allows one to make such statements (Simon 2017).

Finally, even under the most favourable conditions, the scientific results of policy analyses are but one among many inputs into the policy-making process. Additionally, there are normative, economic, ethical, ideological, political and pragmatic inputs which must be accommodated. In accommodation, the influence of scientific research is usually obscured to the point where it can no longer be recognised. It should not be inferred from this that the policy analysis is not utilised, only that the research results are but one voice in the cacophony of the policy-making process. Weiss (1972) has written vastly on the utilisation problem and ways in which evaluation can be used effectively to change the policy. The author discussed that '*in its ideal form, evaluation is conducted for a client who has decisions to make and who looks to the evaluation for answers on which to base his decisions*'. This does not happen generally, however, as evaluation results seldom influence the important decisions regarding programmes and policies. Regarding utilisation, Weiss (1972) concluded that evaluation results affect the public policy by serving as the impetus for public discourse and debate which form social policy, rather than through extensive programme termination or reform.

11. Conclusion

Public policy consists of rules, regulations and guidelines formulated by Government for solving problems that have an impact on common public and society. There must be sufficient description of public policy for proper evaluation and understanding, but several public policies are very complex, especially as delivered in the field. Public policy analysis is a large, sprawling intellectual enterprise that involves many academic disciplines, private research organisations and governmental agencies, each sharing a common matter with formulation, implementation or consequences of public policy decisions. Public policy analysis is concerned with application of social science theories and methods to analyze matters of public importance. Various research works conducted under rubric of public policy analysis, even when restricted to social science component, have been found perhaps as the distinguishing characteristic of the subject. Policy analysis, evaluation, formulation, adoption and

implementation of a principle or course of action have been intended to ameliorate economic, social or other public issues.

The policy analysis is concerned mainly with the policy alternatives which are expected to give novel solutions. Policy outcomes may be seen in many forms like tangible outputs and less-tangible outputs for which the impacts are more difficult to evaluate. Policy analysts generally use theoretically grounded statistical models to evaluate if the policy will have desired impact. In final stage of policy analysis, the policy analysts correlate the data to determine which policy alternative will be best to fulfil present and future requirements. The empirical public policy analysis has been stated to be of two kinds, i.e. qualitative studies and quantitative studies. Decision theory is an attempt to explore all possible contingencies extant in a particular policy. Decision theory involves determining probability which various events will occur and factoring that probability into decision analysis. Policy analysts may use experimentation to cost-effectively '*test*' public policy alternatives. Through policy analysis, it is possible to have greater understanding of projected costs and possible benefits which will emerge from adoption of a particular policy alternative. The decision makers usually seek most economical alternative possible- the alternative which offers most in the way of benefit and least in the way of cost. Thus, the policy analysis can help decision makers to make rational decisions. Implementation analysis is an essential component of all capable policy evaluations. Utilisation is an ongoing problem in the field of evaluation research. The evaluation results affect public policy by serving as impetus for public discourse and debate that form social policy, rather than through extensive programme termination or reform.

Acknowledgements

This study was conducted out as a component of the Corresponding Author's Study in Partial fulfillment for the requirements of his Doctor's Degree Programme of Political Science at Awdesh Pratap Singh University (APSU), Rewa, MP, India. Hence, the authors are grateful to the authorities of APSU, Rewa for registering and admitting the first author as PhD Research Scholar, and also to the Principal, Govt. TRS College (Autonomous), Rewa for permitting the first author to conduct his research work. The first author also thankfully acknowledges to all the participants who helped him during the course of research study, especially to Prof. (Dr.) Govind Pandey for helping in the writing of research work.

Declarations

Source of Funding

This research work did not receive any grant from funding agencies in the public or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare no competing financial, professional and personal interests.

Consent for publication

Authors declare that they consented for the publication of this research work.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed in data analysis and paper drafting.

References

Chambers, K., Wedel, K.R. and Rodwell, M.K. (1992). *Evaluating Social Programs*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Cook, T. and Campbell, D. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation*. Rand MacNally, Chicago.

Dubnick, M. and Bardes, B. (1983). *Thinking about Public Policy: A Problem Solving Approach*. John Wiley, New York.

Gueron, J.M. (1997). Learning about welfare reform: Lessons from state-based evaluations. Rog, D. and Fournier, D. (eds.). *New Directions for Evaluation*, 76: 79-94.

Haveman, R. (1977). *A Decade of Federal Antipoverty Programs: Achievements, Failures and Lessons*. Academic, New York.

Johnson, D., Meiller, L., Miller, L. and Summers, G. (1987). *Needs Assessment: Theory and Methods*. Iowa State University Press, Ames.

Judd, C. and Kenny, D. (1981). *Estimating the Effects of Social Interventions*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Levin, H. (1975). Cost-effectiveness analysis in evaluation research. In: *Handbook of Evaluation Research*, Guttentag, M. and Struening, E. (eds.). Sage, Newbury Park, California.

Levitin, S. (1985). *Programs in Aid of the Poor*. Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lipsey, M.W. (1997). What can you build with thousands of bricks? Musings on the cumulation of knowledge in program evaluation. Rog, D. and Fournier, D. (eds.). *New Directions for Evaluation*, 76: 7-24.

Loftin, C. and McDowell, D. (1981). One with a gun gets you two: Mandatory sentencing and firearms violence in detroit. *Annals Amer. Aca. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 455: 150-168.

MacRae, D. (1985). *Policy Indicators: Links between Social Science and Public Debate*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Marmor, T. (1970). *The Politics of Medicare*. Aldine, New York.

Moynihan, D. (1973). *The Politics of a Guaranteed Annual Income: The Nixon Administration and the Family Assistance Plan*. Vintage, New York.

Nagel, S. (1984). *Contemporary Public Policy Analysis*. University of Alabama Press, Birmingham.

Rogers, J. (1989). Social Science disciplines and policy research: The case of Political Science. *Policy Studies Review*, 9: 13-28.

Rossi, P., Freeman, H. and Lipsey, M. (1998). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*, 6th Edn. Sage, Newbury Park, California.

Rossi, P. and Lyall, K. (1976). *Reforming Public Welfare*. Russell Sage, New York.

Shadish, W.R., Jr., Cook, T.D. and Leviton, L.C. (1991). *Foundations of Program Evaluation*. Sage, Newbury Park, California.

Simon, C.A. (2017). *Public Policy: Preferences and Outcomes* (Ebook, ISBN- 9781315474458), 3rd Edn. Taylor & Francis Group, New York, USA.

StateUniversity.com (2022). *Public Policy Analysis- Major Students, Policies and Analysis*/<https://education.stateuniversity.com/pages>.

Sussman, B. (1988). *What Americans Really Think and Why Our Politicians Pay No Attention*. Pantheon, New York.

Verba, S. and Nie, N. (1975). *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. Harper and Row, New York, USA.

Weiss, C.H. (1972). *Evaluation Research: Methods for Assessing Program Effectiveness*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Weiss, C.H. (1988). *Evaluation for decisions: Is anybody there? Does anybody care?* *Evaluation Practice*, 9: 15-28.

Wholey, J.S. (1997). *Clarifying goals, reporting results*. Rog, D. and Fournier, D. (eds.). *New Directions for Evaluation*, 76: 95-106.

Wikipedia (2022a). *Centre for Policy Research*.

Wikipedia (2022b). *Centre for Public Policy Research*.

Wikipedia (2022c). *Indian School of Public Policy*.

Yates, B.T. (1996). *Analyzing Costs, Procedures, Processes and Outcomes in Human Services*. SAGE, Thousand Oaks, California.